

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 23, 2005. Claims 1, 17, 62 and 63 are presented for examination. Claims 13, 29, 58, 60 and 64 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 60 and 65 have been canceled, and their recitations incorporated into Claims 1 and 17 respectively; this action is taken without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 62 and 63 have been amended to correct claim dependency and to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 1 and 17 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that Claims 61-63 and 65 would be allowable if rewritten so as not to depend from a rejected claim, and to overcome the Response to Amendment/Arguments, set forth in the Office Action. Claim 1, the base claim of Claim 61, has been rewritten to include the recitation of allowable Claim 61. Claim 1 also has been amended to overcome the objection in the Response to Amendment/Arguments set forth in the Office Action. Specifically, the phrase “to a communication unit” has been added to the “transmission operation” step to clarify the destination of the digital information. In addition, the “request operation” step has been incorporated, in relevant part, to the immediately preceding element, which now reads “in a case in which the requested bandwidth allocation is not allocated, a renegotiation operation for requesting an allocation of a new bandwidth”. It is believed that the objections to Claims 1 and 61 in the Response to Amendment/Arguments have been overcome and their withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Similarly, Claim 17, the base claim of Claim 65, has been rewritten to include the recitation of allowable Claim 65, and the amendments corresponding to those discussed above

with respect to Claim 1 have been made to Claim 17 to overcome the objections in the Response to Amendment/Arguments, set forth in the Office Action.

Claim 62 has been amended to depend from Claim 1, and Claim 63 has been amended to depend from Claim 62. Claims 62 and 63 have also been amended for purposes of clarification.


Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 1, 17, 62 and 63 are now in condition for allowance.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'L. P. Diana', written over a horizontal line.

Leonard P. Diana  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.: 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 524906v1